

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TABASUM QUBAD,

Plaintiff

v.

FARMER BROS. CO., et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:25-cv-01253-APG-EJY

**Order**

Defendants Farmer Bros. Co., Brewmatic Co., and Brewmatic International removed this action from state court based on diversity jurisdiction. ECF No. 1. The plaintiff's complaint names all three as defendants. ECF No. 1-1 at 2-3. The defendants' certificate of interested parties states that Farmer Bros. Co. is a citizen of Delaware and Texas and that the two Brewmatic entities do "not exist as . . . separate entit[ies]." ECF No. 3 at 2. The certificate of interested parties thus does not identify their citizenship. But the defendants' petition for removal states that "Brewmatic Co. and Brewmatic International are subsidiaries of Farmer Bros. Co. and were incorrectly named as individual parties." *Id.* at 2. Subsidiary companies are usually separate entities subject to suit individually. *See, e.g., Ranza v. Nike, Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1059, 1070 (9th Cir. 2015) ("As a general principle, corporate separateness insulates a parent corporation from liability created by its subsidiary, notwithstanding the parent's ownership of the subsidiary."). The petition for removal does not otherwise explain why these entities were not properly named even if they are Farmer Bros. Co.'s subsidiaries.

Because it is unclear whether the Brewmatic defendants are separate subsidiary entities as described in the complaint and in the petition for removal, or something else (perhaps "doing business as" names), I order the defendants to explain the relationship among these entities and

1 to support their position that the Brewmatic defendants were not correctly named as parties in  
2 this case such that their citizenship is irrelevant for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.

3 I THEREFORE ORDER that by July 31, 2025, the defendants shall file a response that  
4 explains the relationship among them as well as any support for their position that the Brewmatic  
5 defendants are not properly named in this case. If the defendants are separate entities, then the  
6 defendants must file a corrected certificate of interested parties that identifies the citizenship of  
7 each defendant for diversity purposes.

8 DATED this 14th day of July, 2025.

9  
10 

11 ANDREW P. GORDON  
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23